

**REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Final Office Action dated February 16, 2006. This response is timely filed, and no fees are believed payable. Nevertheless, authorization to charge any necessary extension or other fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0951 is attached hereto.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, objections were raised to the drawings and specification. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 2-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

**I. Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description, namely resistors R1-R5. A revised Fig. 1 is enclosed, which deletes resistors R1-R5. Withdrawal of the drawing objections is thus respectfully requested.

**II. Objections to the Specification**

The disclosure was objected to because it makes an improper reference to claim 6 in paragraph [0012]. The details of claim 8 as filed have been added to the specification in paragraph [0012], because claim 8 was a more appropriate fit with the meaning of the paragraph than claim 6. The amendments made to the specification are believed to overcome the objection, and withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 1 has been amended to change "low drain-source resistor" to "low drain-source resistance", and also has been amended to introduce the subject matter of claim 2 that

there is one switching means provided per sensor. It is believed that claim 1 is now fully enabled, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Claim Rejections on Art**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,642,711 to Kawate et al. ("Kawate"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,198 to Hohl ("Hohl"). Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,370 to James. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,971 to Smolenski et al ("Smolenski"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,324 to Uber, III et al. ("Uber"). Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Uber as applied to claim 8, and further view of James. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate and Uber as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Smolenski. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hohl, in view of James and Kawate. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. The claim now recites that precisely one single MOSFET (and no more) is provided per switching means. A similar amendment has been made to claim 8. This limitation distinguishes claim 1 over the prior art of Kawate. The amendment finds support in the originally filed drawing wherein S1 to S4 are MOSFETs, see paragraph [020], second sentence. From this drawing as well as the disclosure in the description it is clear to a person skilled in the art that only one single MOSFET is provided per sensor. The last sentence of the rejection under paragraph 4 related to the resistors R1 to R4 has been overcome with the amendment of figure 1.

In figure 2 of Kawate there are provided in part two pairs of transistors T3 and T4, each sensor sense coil having such a pair of transistors T3 and T4. This means that with the amendment

Amendment

Reply to Final Office Action dated February 16, 2006

to claim 1, this prior art document does not show the use of one single MOSFET as switching means per sensor, but the use of two switching means or MOSFET's per sensor.

The rejection under paragraphs 7 and 8 with regard to claim 2 (which has now been incorporated into claim 1) on the basis of Hohl is not correct in applicant's view. The switching means in Hohl are bipolar transistors and as such cannot simply be compared to the MOSFET according to amended claim 1. Furthermore, the working principle of the circuit of Hohl is different to that of the circuit of the present application.

For the reasons given above, independent claims 1 and 8 are believed to relate to patentable subject matter, and to be in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are believed allowable because of their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

**V. Conclusion**

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/14/06

  
J. Rodman Steele, Jr.  
Registration No. 25,931  
Sarah E. Smith  
Registration No. 50,488  
**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

Docket No. 304-820